### NO. ( 45600-1-II )

# (COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION TWO) OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Diane Matheny, Appellant Petitioner,

v.

Robert Levesque,

& Respondent

Priscilla Levesque,

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

PRO-SE ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

DIANE C. MATHENY

P. O. BOX 11374

OLYMPIA, WA. 98508

(360) 753-5464

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Table of Authorities	Page 1.
В.	Assignments of Error	Page 3.
C.	Issues pertaining to Assignments of Error	Page 5.
D.	Statement of the case.	Page 6.
E.	Summary of Argument	Page 8.
F.	Argument	Page 9.
G.	Conclusion	Page 10.
H.	Declaration of Appellant	Page 11.
I.	Proceedings	Page 13.

J. Verbatim Report of Proceedings Page 16.

K. Involved parties list Page 35.

M. Appendix. Page 37.

#### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.

Table of cases.

#### A. FEDERAL CASES:

Page: 1.

Constitution of the United States of America.

Amendment/Article 5, Article 14, (1789) (1868).

- B. All Washington State cases.
- 1. Superior Court of the State of Washington.

In and for the County of Thurston. Real Property Judgement.

Plaintiff Levesque vs. Matheny. Dated: August 23, 2013

Case # 13-2-00619-4

2. Washington State Court of Appeals. District II.

Appellant Diane C. Matheny vs. Robert Levesque, et-al, Respondant.

Case# 45600-1-II

# 3. Washington State Court of Appeals

Case: Edwards v. Powell

Date 2011. Book 144. Page 103.

Washington State Appellate Reports.

# 4. Washington State Superior Court.

Case. Goettmoeller v. Twist.

Date 2011. Book 101. Page 103.

Washington Appellate Reports.

#### B. STATUTES.

- 1. CR 5.
- 2. CR 5 (a).
- 3. CR 5. (g).
- 4. RCW 4.28.080
- 5. RCW 7.28.120
- 6. RCW 11.96.(A). 110
- 7. RCW 19.40.061. (1), (i), (3), (4)
- 8. RCW 26. 50. 030

2.



#### A. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR.

- 1. The court erred by entering the Order that gave the Plaintiff's permission to serve Defendant by regular mail when presented with "Plaintiff's Order to Show Cause" "Plaintiff's Motion and Order for Service by Mail". CR 5. (a). Dated October 18, 2013.

  Page 19, lines 9 23. of Verbatim Report of Proceedings.
- 2. The Court erred by not requesting that Plaintiff's serve Defendant with "Certified or Registered Mail" as required in CR 5. (g). Dated October 10, 2013.

Page 19, line 9 - 23. of Verbatim Report of Proceedings.

Page 19, lines 20 – 23. of Verbatim Report of proceedings.

- 3. The trial court erred in entering the Summary Judgement and Order on August 23, 2013., without Defendant in attendance or valid "Proof of Service" by Plaintiff's as to Defendant being legally served proper notice of trial in accordance with CR 5 (a) and CR 5 (g). No proof of service is in court file. (RCW 7.28.120)
- 4. The court erred by allowing a Quiet Title action against a vested owner of

deed, whereas Quiet Title is reserved for Bona fided purchases of property where an unidentified heir or like, becomes revealed. Plaintiff's/
Respondant's are not Bona fided purchasers for the reason Appellant's name is clearly on the preceding deeds, tax assessments, mortgage, etc.

Page 19, lines 20 – 23. of Verbatim report of Proceedings.

- 5. The court erred whereas Plaintiff's/Respondants are required (RCW 7.28.120) the plaintiff in such action shall set forth in his complaint the nature of his estate, claim or title to the property, and the defendant may set up a legal or equitable defence to plaintiff's claims, and the superior shall prevail. Plaintiff does not have a legal deed to present, nor any deed of ownership, therefore cannot maintain an action of quiet title.
- 6. Court continually fails to establish ownership of property in question.
- 7. The court erred in not enforcing the United States Bill of Rights in it's totality, 5<sup>th</sup> Article, 14<sup>th</sup> Article.
- 5<sup>th</sup>. The Constitution of the United States protects those rights of citizens and land owners, unless by Deed or Due Process of Law.
- 14th. Amendment abridged the "privileges and immunities' of citizens: to deprive

any person of life, liberty, or property, without "due process of law" or deny any person, "the equal protection of the laws".

#### B. ISSUES PERTAINING TO ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

1. Does the court have a legal right to give away someone's real or personal property without any notification to the owner of said property? RCW 7.28.120

Assignments of Error #'s 1, 2, 3, 4, & 5.

Page 19, lines 20 – 23. of Verbatim Report of Proceeding's.

- 2. Does the court have the legal right to grant an "Order" to a "Motion" when the evidence in said Motion presented to Court suggests that Defendant will probably "NOT" receive this Service of Document's in the same manner that Plaintiff is presenting as all attempts in the past have failed to be served? CR 5. RCW 7.28.120. Assignments of Error #'s 1, 2, & 3. Page 19., lines 20 23. of Verbatim report of Proceedings.
- 3. Why would the court grant a Motion that so blatantly all but guarantees that Defendant will "NOT" be served and subsequently unlawfully loose

her real and personal property? Does the court have the right to just take possession of and then give away anyone's property with no evidence or permission from Legal Property owner?

Assignments of Error #'s 1, 2, & 3.

Page 19, lines 20 – 23. of Verbatim Report of Proceedings.

#### C. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This case and issues presented, concern the fraudulent transfer of deeds, a Summary Judgement, all based on the principle-underlying issues of those actions. A foundation of fraud and Judicial misconduct. RCW 19.40.061 (1), (i), (3), (4).

Page 19. Lines 20 – 23. of Verbatim Report of Proceedings.

Appellant was never served with any "Notice to Appear" for
 Judgement Hearing dated August 23, 2013. This fact is clearly governed
 by Washington State Laws included in RCW 11. 96A. 110., CR 5. (a).
 Page 27, lines 12 – 17. of Verbatim Report of Proceedings.

This issue closely resembles "Goettmoeller v. Twist".

Washington State Appellate Reports. Book 101. Page 103. Year 2011. Service of a Summons at a private mail box is not suffcient to effectuate substitute service under RCW 4. 28. 080. (16)., when that mailbox address at which service was attempted was no valid substitute service, accordingly, we reverse the trial court and remand for dismissal for "Improper Service". CR 5. (a).

RCW 4. 28. 080 Summons; How Served.

3. Two attempts of service were done in illegal manner. CR 5 (g).

This issue closely resembles the situation in Edwards v. Powell.

Washington State Appellate Reports, Book 144. Page 109. Year 2007.

Process service, Personal Service, Personal Service delivery by eroneously served person. A person who is eroneously served with a summons and complaint by a process server can effect service on the named Defendant by personally delivering the summons and complaint named Defendant, or by leaving the summons and complaint at the Defendant's house of usual abode with a person of suitable age and discretion who lives herein at time of service if the person is

more than 18 year's old is competent to be a witness and is not a party to the action.

RCW 26. 50. 030

#### D. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Appellant Diane C. Matheny was never given any legal notice of any impending Superior Court Case that involved her. CR 5.

Verbatim Report of Proceedings: Page 18. lines 12 – 25. Page 19. lines 1 – 23.

Appellant was denied her Constitutional Right's provided by the United States Constitution. (Bill of Rights).

Plaintiff's and their attorney J. Zittel did knowingly falsify service of court documents to Defendant- Appellant Diane C. Matheny CR 5.

Appellant was illegally served and illegally attempt at service by Plaintiff's and their attorney J. Zittel. CR 5. (g).

#### E. ARGUMENT

"I" is referenced to myself, Diane C. Matheny, Appellant.

Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorney did illegally and with forthought make sure that "I" Defendant, had no knowledge of the Superior Court proceedings for this property dispute to be heard on August 23, 2013.

Thurston County Superior Court. CR 5.

Page 18. Line 12 - 25. Page 19. Line 1 - 23. of Verbatim Report of Proceedings.

STATUTES: Pertaining to Argument.

- 1. CR 5.
- 2. CR 5 (a).
- 3. CR 5 (g).
- 4. RCW 4.28.080.(16)
- 5. RCW 7.28.120
- 6. RCW 11.96.(A). 110

- 7. RCW 19.40.061. (1), (I), (3), (4)
- 8. RCW 26. 50. 030
- 9. United State Constitution (Bill of Rights).

#### CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above the Appellant respectufully requests that the Appellate Court reverse the Superior Court's ruling in this matter and return Appellant's legal ownership ownership of said property. Appellant is a citizen of this United States, and has full rights to be protected by the Constitution of Law, Bill of Rights, Courts, States, to abide within the Laws of the United States of America.

# COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

In re:

No. 45600-1-II

DIANE C. MATHENY

Declaration of Appellant.

Appellant

VS.

ROBERT LEVESQUE

&

Respondant

PRISCILLA LEVESQUE

I, Diane C. Matheny, declare that I am at least 18 year's of age and am Appellant In this case.

My signature below is my verification of this brief. RAP 18.7., APR 13(a). I certify (declare) under penalty of purgury under the laws of the state of Washington that the forgoing is true and correct.

11.

Signed in Olympia, Washington, County of Thurston on July 18 , 2014.

DIANE C. MATHENY

#### **PROCEEDINGS**

- 1. 03/21/2013 Case information cover sheet.
- 2. 03/21/2013 Complaint.
- 3. 03/21/2013 Affidavit in support by P. Levesque
- 4. 03/21/2013 Ex-parte action with Order summons.
- 5. 07/16/2013 Motion for Summary Judgement.
- 6. 07/16/2013 Affidavit in support of R. Levesque.
- 7. 07/29/2013 Motion for Default.
- 8. 08/08/2013 Affidavit/declaration of service.
- 9. 08/08/2012 Notice of issue. Action summary.
  - 08/23/2013 Judgement/Dismissal Secondary 09/08/2013
- 10. 08/23/2013 Summary Judgement hearing.Judge Christine Schaller.
- 08/23/2013 Order granting Summary Judgement.
   CC. Pittman. CR. Schackell.
- 12. 08/23/2013 Notice of issue. Secondary 09/08/2013Action Summary Judgement.
- 13. 08/23/2013 Declaration Diane Matheny.

- 14. 09/06/2013 Notice of issue. Action Summary/Judgement Dismissal.
- 15. 09/06/2013 Declaration. Diane Matheny.
- 16. 09/06/2013 Proposed Order/findings.
- 17. 09/06/2013 Writ of Restitution.
- 18. 09/10/2013 Motion Stay of Execution of Writ.
- 19. 09/20/2013 Order denying Motiom/petition.
- 20. 09/23/2013 Request for Discovery.
- 21. 09/23/2013 Notice of Defendant.
- 09/24/2013 Order. Action Challenge to stay Writ.
   Secondary 11/01/2013.
- 23. 09/24/2013 Ex-parte Action with Order.
- 24. 10/18/2013 Notice of Issue. Secondary 11/01/2013

  Action. Presentation of Judgement.
- 25. Declaration of J. Zittel
- 26. 10/18/2013 Response.
- 27. 11/01/2013 Motion hearing. Judge Christine Schaller.CC. Pittman. CR. Schackell.
- 28. 11/01/2013 Judgement.

- 29. 11/19/2013 Ex-parte Action with Order
- 30. 12/16/2013 Motion for stay.

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF THURSTON

ROBERT LEVESQUE and PRISCILLA LEVESQUE, COURT OF APPEALS NO.45600-1-II

Plaintiff, THURSTON COUNTY

vs. NO. 13-2-00619-4

DIANE C. MATHENY and HEIDI LEE ASHLEY, Defendant.

### **VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**

BE IT REMEMBERED that on August 23, 2013, the above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the HONORABLE CHRISTINE SCHALLER, Judge of Thurston County Superior Court.

Reported by:

Aurora Shackell, RMR CRR

Official Court Reporter, CCR# 2439 2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Bldg No. 2

Olympia, WA 98502 (360) 786-5570

shackea@co.thurston.wa.us

# <u>APPEARANCES</u>

JASON ZITTEL For the Plaintiff:

Jay A. Goldstein Law Office PLLC

1800 Cooper Point Rd SW Ste 8 Olympia, WA 98502-1179

For the Defendant:

THE COURT: Number 21, Levesque versus

Matheny. This matter comes before the Court on
plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. Is it

Mr. Zittel?

MR. ZITTEL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Zittel is present on behalf of the plaintiff, and, of course, I reviewed the motion for summary judgment. No response was filed. The defendants have not appeared, and it is 9:15. I normally wait 15 minutes to give them an opportunity to appear. Go ahead.

MR. ZITTEL: Okay. Your Honor, I just want to point out something regarding service on this. I don't know if their answer got into the file, if they filed it. I did receive a very pro se-style answer that came in a manila envelope with the return address that her property is located at. There is a motion that we actually had when she was dodging service originally, and there was a motion for service by mail. That was done and granted, but we did end up with personal service on her eventually anyway.

And I just want to point out that the answer we got had a return address on the manila envelope, and that's where we then serviced by mail for this motion

for summary judgment to her. I don't know whether this answer made it into the file or not.

THE COURT: Are you talking about an answer to the motion for summary judgment?

MR. ZITTEL: No, just the regular answer to the complaint.

THE COURT: No, there has been nothing placed in the file by any of the defendants.

MR. ZITTEL: I wanted you to know that that's what I used for the basis for the service of the mailing to her for this motion in particular.

THE COURT: To give her notice.

MR. ZITTEL: To give her notice of this motion.

THE COURT: You gave her what you have --

MR. ZITTEL: What I have, yeah. She gave a manila envelope with the return address on it with a pro se -- I mean, it's just a bunch of documents answered --

THE COURT: I find that there has been appropriate notice of the hearing, that no response has been filed to this motion, and I will grant the motion for summary judgment.

MR. ZITTEL: May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. And I appreciate you

```
clarifying that for the record.
 1
 2
                              --000--
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

#### CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF WASHINGTON )
COUNTY OF THURSTON )

I, AURORA J. SHACKELL, CCR, Official
Reporter of the Superior Court of the State of
Washington, in and for the County of Thurston, do hereby
certify:

I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings held in the above-entitled matter, as designated by Counsel to be included in the transcript, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

Dated this the \_\_\_\_ day of March, 2014.

AURORA J. SHACKELL, RMR CRR Official Court Reporter CCR No. 2439

21.

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF THURSTON

ROBERT LEVESQUE and PRISCILLA LEVESQUE, COURT OF APPEALS NO.45600-1-II

Plaintiff, THURSTON COUNTY

Vs. NO. 13-2-00619-4

DIANE C. MATHENY and HEIDI LEE ASHLEY, Defendant.

# VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

BE IT REMEMBERED that on November 1, 2013, the above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the HONORABLE CHRISTINE SCHALLER, Judge of Thurston County Superior Court.

Reported by:

Aurora Shackell, RMR CRR

Official Court Reporter, CCR# 2439 2000 Lakeridge Drive SW, Bldg No. 2

Olympia, WA 98502 (360) 786-5570

shackea@co.thurston.wa.us

### **APPEARANCES**

For the Plaintiff:

JASON ZITTEL

Jay A. Goldstein Law Office PLLC 1800 Cooper Point Rd SW Ste 8 Olympia, WA 98502-1179

For the Defendant:

DIANE MATHENY HEIDI LEE ASHLEY (Appearing Pro Se) P.O. Box 11374

Olympia, WA 98508

this matter.

THE COURT: Number 23, Levesque versus

Matheny. This matter comes before the Court on the defendant's motion requesting that the Court stay the writ of execution. The defendant had previously filed a notice of issue for summary judgment but never filed a summary judgment motion, and then the plaintiff has filed a notice of issue requesting that a judgment be entered on this date consistent with the order for summary judgment previously entered in

Mr. Zittel is present on behalf of the plaintiff.

And you are Ms. Matheny; is that correct?

MS. MATHENY: Yes, and this is Heidi Ashley.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ashley, you are certainly free to be present at the hearing today. There is a default order entered against you. You never responded in this matter, and I don't intend to necessarily hear argument. You haven't filed a motion for any sort of affirmative relief to address any issues, and, again, a default order was entered against you some time ago.

With that, Ms. Matheny, you can go ahead and make your argument as it relates to your motion to stay the writ of execution.

MS. MATHENY: Okay. Before that, Your Honor,

I have this to submit to the Court. I submitted a request for discovery from Mr. Zittel back on September 23rd.

THE COURT: Ms. Matheny, you don't get to hand forward documents today for my consideration. The Court only considers documents that are filed timely, consistent with our filing requirements. This hearing was set some time ago, and you've had ample opportunity to provide information into the record that you thought was important for my consideration. I am only considering what is in the court file at this time, that was timely filed. You may only refer to facts that are in the record. Go ahead with your argument as it relates to your motion to stay the execution of the writ.

MS. MATHENY: Here is my copy for the Court, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Matheny, I don't know what you have for the Court. You can file whatever you want. I am not considering anything that was not filed timely for the purposes of our hearing today. You may only refer to facts that are in the record. You have ten minutes to make your argument, and we are already two minutes into your ten-minute time period.

MS. MATHENY: Your Honor, I called the clerk's

office and asked if I could turn in my discovery beforehand and was told explicitly that I do not, that I bring it to court. So I was following what they told me. I wanted to turn it in earlier, but I was told I could not.

THE COURT: I don't know what you were or were not told. I am indicating that there are filing requirements. I am not considering anything that you are handing forward today. You are free to file whatever you want in the court file. Go ahead with your argument on your motion to stay the writ of execution.

MS. MATHENY: All right. Your Honor, I have had adverse possession of the property in mention for over 15 years. I have never been asked in all those years to vacate anything by legal owners Dorothy, Priscilla or Robert Levesque until 2013. Contract one, which I believe you have a copy of, defense agreement in water --

THE COURT: Ms. Matheny, where have you submitted these facts to the record?

MS. MATHENY: I brought them with me, because that's what I was told to do.

THE COURT: You cannot refer to facts that are not in the record. There are no facts in the record.

And the clerks can't give you legal advice. I don't know what they did or did not tell you, but I am not referring to anything that's not in the record. You need to confine yourself to those facts.

MS. MATHENY: Well, I don't know what Mr. Zittel has given, so I can't talk about what's in your hands.

THE COURT: Ms. Matheny, I'm referring to your motion. Facts you have submitted to the record for the purposes of your motion, that's what I can consider today.

MS. MATHENY: Well, neither defendants, myself nor Heidi Ashley, were given any notice of the original court date. I couldn't respond, because, obviously, I did not get service for that court date. So that's what this was for today, was to actually go to trial and present my evidence.

THE COURT: There's no trial today. This is not a trial. This is a motion hearing, and so that's what I'm hearing today, not a trial. It's never been set for trial.

MS. MATHENY: Then I am making a motion to reset the trial date, and the reason for it is because I requested discovery from plaintiff's attorney on 9-23-2013. That service has been

recorded with the Court. I've never received any discovery or correspondence from the plaintiff's attorney in any way. I also have here with me an order and full explanation, and I also have proof that Mr. Zittel was served.

THE COURT: This your opportunity, you can keep going with your argument. I'm listening.

MS. MATHENY: Well, I can't proceed with a case that I don't know what has been presented to the Court. I do have a right to discovery. I know that is law. And that I have to receive that within 11 days before the actual court date. I requested that from Mr. Zittel September 23rd, and I have never received anything. So it's pretty hard for me to present my case when I haven't been presented any documents from opposing attorney.

So, today, I am asking for a motion that

Mr. Zittel be told by the Court to present me with
his discovery and that we reset for another trial
date.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. MATHENY: Or hearing date.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Zittel.

MR. ZITTEL: For the record, Your Honor, Jason Zittel for the plaintiffs in this matter. There are



some basic uncontroverted facts I think in this situation that I'd just like to go through regarding the service and how this was made. There was actually a service-by-mail order originally issued in this case due to attempts by the defendant to avoid service. That's on file. It was signed by the commissioner.

Defendant actually lives where the motion for summary judgment was mailed. Not only that, but the defendant listed this address on the return mailing address in a pro se answer that was delivered to my office in April. And on her pro se notice of appearance in another Thurston County Superior Court matter filed in September of 2013, she listed this same address as her notification.

Both of those things are documented in my declaration supporting -- supporting denial of the defendant's motion. And the document was both mailed to this address, and it was timely filed with the Court.

Now, the defendant's motion, as far as I can tell, can most accurately be described as a CR 60 motion.

In a lot of ways, it bears a lot of resemblance to a CR 60 motion to remove a default. But there are four requirements for such a motion, and that is that

there is substantial evidence to support a prima facie case, and that has to be -- that has to be demonstrated to the Court; the moving party must demonstrate that their failure to respond was based on excusable neglect; the moving party must have acted with due diligence after notice of the default to remove the default; and that there will be no substantial hardship to the opposing party.

The defendant in this case has filed nothing to support any of these factors. And while she may not -- you know, she's representing herself. It's very -- she still has to comply with the rules of civil procedure in this matter. And, for those reasons, I'm asking you to deny this motion and also to sign the real property judgment that is consistent with the motion for summary judgment order that you issued in August. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Matheny.

MS. MATHENY: Yes. I actually brought mail with me from Mr. Goldenstein's office that made it to my address. I also have another one here from the Washington State Supreme Court. They also made it to my address just fine. I receive mail there all the time. And, Your Honor, I can't proceed with a case that I haven't been given all the facts. I requested

totally legally, you have that service, I do have a copy of it right here, that he was served so that I would have the discovery. I have unmitigated proof that the property is mine. I have title. assessor's office copies. I have been paying the taxes on the sheds. They're on my property. the state surveyor's map that shows the sheds and everything are on my property. I am not willing to give away my property because my case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

opposing counsel is not giving me a chance to present I have unmitigated proof through state and federal offices saying that this property is mine. And I believe that's why this was rushed through without my knowledge for the first court date, because they know they cannot win this case. I have state and federal governments stating that it's my property. They can't just take my property and say that I was served.

So that's why I need this reset for trial date, so that I can properly present my case, Your Honor.

MR. ZITTEL: Your Honor, may I briefly respond?

> THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ZITTEL: Your Honor, while the defendant claims that she has not had an opportunity to

24

25

respond, at multiple times since the motion was filed, I have filed declarations in district court. I have filed declarations in Superior Court on related but distinct matters that included the motion for summary judgment in full, and this motion has been filed. She's known about it here as well in this court, those documents. She's had notice of everything that was in that motion for summary judgment for quite some time now, and it's part of a motion for CR 60. She could have responded to the factual allegations contained in that motion for summary judgment to establish her prima facie case if she had one. She hasn't. And for those reasons, I think that you should deny her motion. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. This matter comes before the Court for two things: Ms. Matheny filed a motion for stay of the writ of execution, and Mr. Zittel filed on behalf of the plaintiff a request for entry of judgment consistent for the order for summary judgment previously entered in this matter.

As it relates to the request to stay the writ of execution, there's been no evidence submitted that would persuade the Court that it needs to stay the writ of execution, and that motion is denied. I'm

11

not treating it as a CR 60 motion. I'm simply treating it as a motion to stay filed by Ms. Matheny. That's what she called the motion, that's the relief she requested in the motion. It is appropriate for the Court to enter a judgment consistent with the summary judgment order previously entered in this matter, and I will do so today. Ms. Matheny, if you believe that you have different legal recourse, you need to follow that. You need to file an appropriate motion, and you need to submit your materials to the record. You have not done that.

I recognize you represent yourself, but you are held to the same standard as a lawyer. The clerk's office is not there to give you legal advice. Go to our website. It tells you exactly what our filing requirements are. Thank you.

MR. ZITTEL: Your Honor, can I bring forward the judgment?

THE COURT: Why don't you first show it to Ms. Matheny, and then, yes, as I indicated, I will sign that.

MS. MATHENY: And, obviously, I'm going to appeal that judgment.

--000--

#### CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF WASHINGTON )
COUNTY OF THURSTON )

I, AURORA J. SHACKELL, CCR, Official
Reporter of the Superior Court of the State of
Washington, in and for the County of Thurston, do hereby
certify:

I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings held in the above-entitled matter, as designated by Counsel to be included in the transcript, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

Dated this the \_\_\_\_ day of March, 2014.

AURORA J. SHACKELL, RMR CRR Official Court Reporter CCR No. 2439

34.

# **INVOLVED PARTIE'S LIST**

# **PLAINTIFF'S:**

Robert R. Levesque

Priscilla J. Levesque

5626 Black Lake Blvd. SW.

Olympia, WA. 98512

(360)352-9506

# **PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY:**

J. Zittels

1800 Cooper Point Rd. SW. #8

**Olympia, WA. 98502** 

(360)352-1970

# **Defendant's:**

**Diane C. Matheny** 

P. O. Box 11374

**Olympia, WA. 98508** 

# (360)753-5464 E-mail: DIANESDDBIRDS@MSN.COM

Heidi L. Ashley

2880 E. Hoquiam Rd.

**Hoquiam, WA. 98550** 

(360)532-0704

36.

# APPENDIX

1. Edwards v. Powell Washington State Superior court	Page 7.		
2. Goettmoeller v. Powell Washington State Superior Court			
	Page 7.		
3. CR 5.	Page's 3, 5, 8.		
4. CR 5 (A).	Page's 3, 6, 7.		
5. CR 5 (G).	Page's 3, 7, 8.		
6. RCW 4. 28.080	Page 7.		
7. RCW 7.28.120	Page 3, 4, 5.		
8. RCW 11.96.(A). 110	Page 6.		
9. RCW 19. 40. 061.	Page 6.		
10. RCW 26 .50. 030	Page 8.		

# COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

_	
ln	re

No. 45600-1-II

Declaration of Service

Diane Matheny

(DCLRM)

Appellant

Vs.

Levesque, Et-al.

Respondant(s).

The undersigned is now and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the United states and resident of the State of washington, over the age of eighteen years, not a party to or interested in the above entitled action and competent to be a witness therein.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that on July 18, 2014 at 13.40 am/pm, at 1800 Cooper Point Rd. Sw. Ste 8. Olympia, Washington 98502, Thurston County, Washington, I duly served documents in the above entitled matter upon

Receptionist, by then and there personally delivering a true and correct copy or copies thereof to and leaving same with Receptionist of J. Zittel.

**DOCUMENTS SERVED** 

Appellate brief.

Signed this 18th day of June, 2014 at Olympia, Thurston County, Washington.

Signature

Frank Knoblock

83 Blach Rd. Oakville, Wa. 98568

(360)273-9442